

It is my belief that the reply from Mr. Thomas J. Sugrue dated May 9, 2001 to Marlys R. Davis from King County, Washington defines the point without question (the input side of the selective router) where the responsibility of costs lies to implement the ability to receive and utilize Phase 1 and Phase 2 data.

I believe the wireless carriers are responsible for all costs of hardware, software, trunk lines, etc. as spelled out in the letter to King County, Washington from the input of the selective router back to the wireless device utilized to dial 9-1-1. I believe the PSAP's are responsible for all costs of hardware, software, trunk lines, etc. , again as spelled out in the letter to King County, Washington, from the input of the selective router to the telephone and computer terminal used in the PSAP to answer that wireless 9-1-1 call.

In Pennsylvania there is no legislation to provide the PSAP's with money from the wireless customers to implement the capability of receiving Phase 1 and Phase 2 wireless 9-1-1 telephone calls and associated data that would provide the location of the wireless telephone when dialing 9-1-1 to the PSAP.

Many individuals and organizations are trying to get legislation passed in Pennsylvania, however, the wireless carriers keep insisting that they receive money from this pending legislation in order to provide the PSAP's with the ability to receive and utilize Phase 1 and Phase 2 data.

I believe the FCC should act on DA 01-1520 to re-affirm the demarcation point of costs between the wireless carriers and the PSAP's defined in the letter to King County, Washington from Thomas J. Sugrue.

I believe the FCC should make it exceedingly clear to the wireless carriers that they have the ability to charge their customers whatever it costs to implement Phase 1 and Phase 2 location ability from their wireless telephones as defined in FCC Docket 94-102 and the various waivers subsequent to that proceeding. This is even a proven fact by the initiation of NEXTEL in their latest bills which show a charge for implementing E911 and on their website at <http://www.nextel.com/fees.shtml> as shown under the heading and explanation of "Federal Programs Cost Recovery Fee" and "State & Local Required 911 Charges".

I believe the FCC should make it exceedingly clear that the last sentence in footnote 4 on page 2 of the letter to King County, Washington was stated because of the many states that already had legislation in place including funding for carrier cost recovery, not to give the wireless carriers the right to lobby those states that do not have legislation in place by suggesting that other states give them money and so should Pennsylvania.

Respectfully submitted,

Carlton B. Walls III